

JUL 15 2005

sparta01.006

PATENT
IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
(sparta01.006)

Applicant:	Flam	Paper No.: N/A
Application No:	10/022,104	Group Art Unit: 2178
Filed:	12/13/01	Examiner: Londra C. Burge FAX: 703-872-9306

Title: *Configuring Activities to Perform Operations on User-Defined Fields*

Commissioner for Patents
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Response to a final Office action under 37 C.F.R. 1.116

Summary of the prosecution

Examiner mailed a first Office action in the above patent application on 10/06/2004. In that Office action, Examiner rejected claim 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. Examiner further rejected claims 1, 2, 5-7, 9, 11, 14, 16, 17-21, 24, 26, 29-31, 33, 36, 37, and 40 under 25 U.S.C 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. patent 5,966,716, Comer, et al., *Automatic Spreadsheet Forms*, having an effective filing date of 07/14/98. Examiner additionally rejected claims 3, 4, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 22, 23, 25, 27, 28, 32, 34, 35, 38, 39, 41, and 42 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Comer as applied to claims in 1, 20, and 37 in view of U.S. Patent 5,371,675, Greif, et al., *A Spreadsheet Program which Implements Alternative Range References*. Applicant amended claim 1 to overcome the rejection of claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. 101 and traversed the rejections of claims 1-40 that were based on 35 U.S.C. 102 or 35 U.S.C. 103.

Examiner mailed a final Office action in the above application on 5/5/05 in which she persisted in her rejection of all of the claims. Applicants' Attorney requested a telephonic interview in this application which Examiner graciously granted. The interview was held at 11:00 on Thursday, July 14. Prior to the interview, Applicants'

Attorney provided *Arguments* to Examiner. During the interview, Applicants' attorney and Examiners Paula and Burge discussed claim 20 of the application. The arguments made by Applicants' attorney were substantially the ones regarding claim 20 that were contained in the *Argument*. At the conclusion of the interview, Examiner Paula suggested that Applicants' attorney present the arguments in a response to a final Office action, which Applicants' attorney is now doing. In this response, Applicants are amending claims 1 and 20 to correct errors noted by Applicants and are traversing the rejections to the claims. In anticipation that the finality of the rejection will be withdrawn, Applicants are further including an IDS containing references cited in the prosecution of the parent of the present patent application and the requisite fee under 37 C.F.R. 1.97(c).

Please amend claims 1 and 20 as follows: